NWS Hydrology Forecast Verification Team
Teleconference Notes
09/03/2008

Agenda

- Presentation of NERFC verification case study by Rob Shedd
- Presentation of OHRFC verification application with Google MotionChart by Tom Adams
- Discussion of COMET verification module and verification workshop with Julie Demargne's slides

Questions and Comments

Rob's presentation

Rob mentioned that he limited the number of basins for this verification case study (11 basins for this analysis) because of speed and memory issues with IVP. There was a discussion on how to increase memory when running IVP (similar to the EVS application).

Please see the IVP documentation available at:
http://www.nws.noaa.gov/oh/hrl/verification/ob8/IVPGui.pdf
in section 25 called Tips and Information (see pages 64-65).

Here are the commands to run:

```
ivp -hh
```
to see the details about the command line options to IVP

```
ivp -s32M -m512M
```
where 32MB is the minimum memory allocation and 512 is the maximum allocation. The maximum memory allocation should be significantly lower than the total amount of RAM available on your machine, as other programs, including the operating system, will require memory to run efficiently.
This command will run IVP with memory settings being the default for newer versions of Java (and on most LX boxes).

There was a comment on using forecast categories when comparing the quality of forecasts from different sources (see slides #7-10). Using forecast categories for different forecast sources will generate groups based on different forecast-observation pairs since two forecasts from different sources for the same observation can fall into 2 different forecasts. Therefore the sample sizes of the different groups for the various forecast categories are likely to vary a lot with the different forecast sources. It is then difficult to know if the variations in the verification statistics between the different forecast sources are due to varying sample sizes. It may be interesting to compute statistics using categories for the observations to maintain the same observed events in each group for all forecast sources.

Tom's presentation

Tom presented the efforts at OHRFC to use Google MotionChart to present verification results. OHRFC provides online a verification graphic with four dimensions and animation scheme at:
http://www.erh.noaa.gov/ohrfc/bubbles.php

This application seems very powerful to display complex information. This application will be discussed again at the RFC verification workshop to determine which verification graphics could be presented to the users.

Julie's presentation

Slide #3: Matt Kelsch mentioned that COMET is developing two other modules on flow forecast verification module and on QPF verification module. For this nodule, COMET got the comment that for the final quiz, the correct should be given. All the comments from the RFCs were very positive and it was recommended to ask all staff at the RFCs to work on that verification training module.
Action: Julie D. will gather all the feedback from the RFCs (via the answers to 6 questions) and send it to COMET. This will also be part of the final team report.
RFC team members, please send your answers to Julie D.

Slide #7: there was a discussion on the workshop location, between CBRFC and WGRFC. There was a vote just after the meeting and CBRFC was selected. Julie D. will send a workshop agenda to the team in advance. Jeff Zimmerman will work on the workshop logistics for this RFC workshop.

The next teleconference will be on **Thursday, September 25 at 12:30 pm EDT**.